

Applicant : Stefan J. Burmeister  
Serial No. : 09/800,543  
Filed : March 6, 2001  
Page : 7 of 8

Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-143001 / 2001 P7507 US  
01

## REMARKS

### **1. Interview Summary**

The applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy of extending telephonic interviews on April 8 and April 15, 2004. During the interviews, claim 1 was discussed in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,191,204 to Dickson et al. ("Dickson"), U.S. Patent No. 5,812,582 to Gilliland et al. ("Gilliland"), and U.S. Patent No. 5,757,829 to Jiang et al. ("Jiang"). On April 8, the Examiner indicated that the claim's rejection would be overcome by amending the claim to recite "only one first VCSEL" and "only one second VCSEL," and similar amendments would overcome the rejections of other independent claims. On April 15, the applicant's representative suggested using the term "exactly one" instead of the term "only one." The Examiner indicated that reciting "exactly one first VCSEL" and "exactly one second VCSEL" would also overcome the rejections.

### **2. Claim rejections**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, 18-20, 22-25 and 27-35 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 18, 22, 27 and 29 have been amended.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, 18-20, 22-25 and 27-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickson in view of Gilliland and Jiang. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Independent claims 1, 18, 22, 27 and 29 have been amended to recite "exactly one first VCSEL" and "exactly one second VCSEL." During the interview, the Examiner indicated that such amendments would overcome the rejections. Therefore, claims 1, 18, 22, 27 and 29 are allowable. Dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8-11, 19-20, 23-25, 28 and 30-35 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

The fact that the applicant has amended a claim does not mean that the applicant has conceded the position of the Examiner with respect to the claim before the amendment. The fact that the applicant has stated certain reasons for patentability of the claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims or other claims.

Applicant : Stefan J. Burmeister  
Serial No. : 09/800,543  
Filed : March 6, 2001  
Page : 8 of 8


Attorney's Docket No.: 12754-143001 / 2001 P7507 US  
01

Ferenc Pazmandi has been given limited recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b) as an employee of the Fish & Richardson PC law firm to prepare and prosecute patent applications wherein the patent applicant is a client of Fish & Richardson PC and the attorney or agent of record in the applications is a registered practitioner who is a member of Fish & Richardson, which is the case in the present application. A copy of the Limited Recognition document, which expires November 10, 2004, is attached hereto.

No fees are believed due, however, please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/15/2004



Ferenc Pazmandi  
Limited Recognition under 37 CFR § 10.9(b)

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
500 Arguello Street, Suite 500  
Redwood City, California 94063  
Telephone: (650) 839-5070  
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071

50207439.doc